PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
Berkeley, California

IS FLESH-EATING MORALLY DEFENSIBLE?

by
SIDNEY H. BEARD

BL
65
V44
B42
1895
GTU
Storage

Third Edition

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE GIFT OF

Pamphlet Collection

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/isflesheatingmor0000sidn

IS FLESH-EATING MORALLY DEFENSIBLE?

BY

SIDNEY H. BEARD

Revised, with Additions

American Edition

Property of
GBSK
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

BL
65
V44
B42
1895

G583
B38

Is Flesh Eating Morally Defensible?

Paper read at Ilfracombe, on Feb. 19th, 1895, by Mr. Sidney H. Beard.

This question, is one that is worthy of our most serious consideration, for it is intimately connected, not only with our own physical and spiritual welfare, but with that of our children and posterity. We all know that the sins of the fathers, are visited upon the children for several generations, and probably, no violations of the Laws which govern man's being, are so frequently punished in this vicarious manner, as sins of diet.

22033

Around us on every hand, we see melancholy illustrations of this terrible fact, in the hundreds of tuberculous and scrofulous children to be found in every large town, in those unfortunates who are crippled by gout and rheumatism, in the early graves which engulf so many consumptive young men and women before they have reached the prime of life, and in the great multitudes of dyspeptics, sufferers from deranged livers, and other invalids, whose number increase with the advance of medical science, instead of decreasing.

It is also connected with the advancement of our race, towards that golden age which some of us dream about and pray for, when the Law of Universal Love shall be reverenced and obeyed by all, and when cruelty and suffering shall be done away with forever. Isaiah describes that happy time, in his vision of the new earth, when

he says: "The voice of weeping and crying shall be heard no more, man shall live out his full length of days, the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and they shall not hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain." Whilst our children are taught by early observation that slaughter and cruelty are part of the established order of things as ordained by God, the realization of this ideal prospect is quite impossible. The prophetic vision will be realized one day, however; and, therefore, those who support the custom of killing sentient creatures, in order to devour their flesh, are upholding a system which bars the progress of our race towards a higher and better state, and, as such is doomed to pass away.

It also bears a close relation to the work of the Church of Christ, in evangelizing and uplifting mankind. The success of religious work depends largely upon the

spiritual tone of professing Christians, and whilst all that is carnal in them is fostered and fed by the consumption of the flesh and blood of animals, those who labour to lead them to a higher state of spiritual experience, are very much hindered in their good work. It is of little use to tell a man about salvation from bad temper, unless you tell him of some method of deliverance from the clogged and sluggish liver, which is the cause of the bad temper. Spiritual weakness and depression, often have a purely physical cause, and that cause is frequently the attempt to make the digestive organs assimilate food which is unnatural, and which produces nervous irritation or prostration. There is little hope of reforming a drunkard by spiritual means only, whilst he is feeding his craving for stimulants by eating flesh, but if he abandons this evil custom, there is abundance of

evidence to prove that his deliverance will then eventually be accomplished. Nothing, probably, hinders the progress of the Gospel in countries like India, more than the practice of Christians with regard to eating and drinking. The Braminical law declared (1,000 years B. C.) that flesh eating was to be abandoned, because it involved slaughter and cruelty. The Buddhist is taught by his religion, that it is contrary to the Will of a benevolent God to kill animals and much more so to eat them. *How can he accept Christianity as a superior religion, when his instincts and religious belief lead him to consider, that the flesh eating missionary is on a lower plane of spirituality than himself?* Should we listen to the teachings of cannibals if they came to instruct us? Converts are often known by the fact of their adopting this pernicious habit, and as the Hindoos

believe it to be a universal Christian practice, they reject the religion of Christ accordingly. I need not say more, to show that the question, is at least one of grave importance to us all, as it must already be apparent to you.

With the earliest impressions of childhood, we have received the idea, that the most important article of our diet is animal flesh (or meat as it is more politely called, in order to disguise somewhat its real nature), and that it is impossible to be vigorous without a liberal consumption of this type of food. In the case of the most of us this idea has been accepted without question or thought (like many of our religious notions), and probably it has never been challenged. Occasionally, we may have felt our spirits slightly depressed, when upon passing some slaughter-house, perchance we have heard the dying groans

of some wretched creature, and have thus been reminded of the fact, that the animals who provide our dinners have to suffer a violent death before we can eat them; but we have generally dismissed the melancholy reflection as hastily as possible, with the thought that the cruel work has to be done, and the less we consider the matter the better. It is rather startling, to be roused from our apathetic unquestioning acceptance of a popular dogma, *by the suggestion that it may be utterly false, and that the practice which is the result of it, is* morally wrong, but this, however, is our position, and as the matter is intimately related to our highest welfare, and also deals with our responsibility as aiders and abettors, of the vast amount of cruelty inseparable from this prevalent custom, we are met together as earnest men and women, to endeavour to find out

whether it is *defensible or not from a moral standpoint.*

Having come at your invitation to open this discussion, by presenting to you those arguments, which, in my opinion should lead you to decide the matter in the negative, let me at the outset crave your indulgence, if, realizing what stupendous issues, what blessed prospects for our country, for humanity, and for the animal kingdom, depend upon the response of the Christian world to this great question (which is every month challenging attention more urgently), I should express my sentiments too earnestly. Standing also as I am, in the presence of many persons much older and wiser than myself, at whose feet I would willingly sit and learn both temporal and spiritual things, let me assure you that nothing is farther from my thoughts, than any attempt to sit in judgment upon the ideas

and daily practice, of those who have never doubted the wisdom and lawfulness of eating animal flesh, *because they have never been led to consider that any principle could be involved in the matter.*

A very large number of reasons might be urged, in support of the statement that the practice of eating the flesh of dead animals is morally wrong, but I have reduced them down to four, as our time is limited. The first two, if admitted to be valid, are alone sufficient to justify one in logically holding such a conviction, but I venture to believe that all of them are of such a nature, as to commend themselves to your judgment, as being based upon sound reason and common sense. They are as follows, viz.:—

1. That as man is stated by all our leading scientists, to be a Frugivorous (or fruit eating) animal, not possessing either

teeth suitable for tearing flesh, or digestive organs by nature adapted to its assimilation (both of which are found in all the carnivora), the voluntary consumption of the dead bodies of animals in a civilized country, is a violation of one of the fundamental laws governing his being, and, therefore *totally unnecessary.*

2. That the custom of eating flesh, involves the infliction of an incalculable amount of suffering and torture upon countless thousands of God's sentient creatures, such enormities as are daily taking place *being utterly unjustifiable, except upon the ground of absolute and unavoidable necessity.* As this necessity does not exist, the perpetration of these cruelties is morally wrong, being an outrage upon all humane sentiment, and a violation of the Christian duty of showing mercy to the weak and defenceless. Those who pur-

chase the flesh create the demand, and are aiders and abettors of the evil, that is done to gratify their degenerate appetites.

3. That the consumption of animal flesh, is the direct cause of an immense amount of human suffering and disease, which afflicts not only the consumers, but their children to the third and fourth generation.

4. That the barbarous practice is detrimental to man's physical, moral and spiritual welfare, and retards the progress of our race towards that golden age of righteousness, love, peace, and goodwill, which prophets have foretold, poets have sung, and the noblest and best of mankind are awaiting with patient assurance and prayerful hope. It is to a large extent the cause of the drunkenness, poverty, crime, and vice, with which our land is cursed, and no reform at present before the public, would

produce such permanent benefit to the community, as the return to the natural food which God originally designed for man.

You will doubtless require evidence in support of these statements, and it shall be placed before you, but permit me to mention, that for each corroborative fact my limited time allows me to bring to your notice, I could produce ten, if the circumstances of this meeting did not prohibit my doing so.

In support then of my first statement, "*That animal food is entirely unnecessary*" (which is the most important of all, seeing that if it is established to your satisfaction, it ought not to be difficult to convince you as earnest men and women, that the wholesale slaughter and abominable cruelties involved in flesh eating are utterly unjustifiable), let me call first as

witnesses, some of our leading scientists and medical men.

LINNÆUS, (whose zoölogical classification is generally accepted), places man with the Anthropoid apes, at the head of the highest order of the mammiferous animals. The structure of these apes bears the closest resemblance to that of man, and they are all fruit eaters.

PROFESSOR OWEN, states that "The Anthropoids and all the Quadrumana, derive their alimentation from fruits, grains, and other succulent vegetable substances, and the strict analogy which exists between the structure of these animals and that of man, clearly demonstrates his frugivorous nature."

CUVIER, says "The natural food of man, judging from his structure, consists of fruit, roots, and vegetables."

PROFESSOR LAWRENCE, states that "The

teeth of man, have not the slightest resemblance to those of carnivorous animals, and whether we consider the teeth, jaws, or digestive organs, the human structure closely resembles that of the frugivorous animals."

Ray, tells us; "Certainly man was never made to be a carnivorous animal."

Sir Henry Thompson, F. R. C. S., states; "It is a vulgar error, to regard meat in any form as necessary to life."

Dr. Spencer Thompson writes: "No physiologist would dispute with those, who maintain that man ought to live on vegetarian diet."

Dr. Lyon Playfair, C. B., says "Animal diet is not essential to man."

Sir B. W. Richardson, at a recent Congress on Public Health, said that "He sincerely hoped that before the close of the century, not only would slaughter-houses

be abolished, but *that all use of animal flesh as food, would be absolutely abandoned.*"

A large number of such authorities could be quoted, but these being of such eminence will suffice.

Now for experimental evidence.

A report upon the food of the agricultural labourers of Europe, taken by order of the English Government and cited in the Anthropological Review of 1872, tells us that in Sweden, Russia, Italy, Bavaria, Ireland, and Holland, the peasants do not eat flesh, whilst in Scotland, Switzerland, Spain and Prussia, the labourers only take it on rare occasions. The same is true of Norwegians and Finns.

The victorious and enterprising Japanese, the Buddhists of Asia, the Brahmins and Hindoos of India, the Bedouin Arabs, the famous porters of Turkey and Greece, numbering collectively hundreds of mil-

lions, and inhabiting every variety of climate, live without eating flesh, as do the Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, and Trappist monks. The conquering soldiers of Rome and Sparta, the athletes and wrestlers of Greece, were generally abstainers from flesh meat, and *thousands of vegetarians of long experience in our own country to-day, can testify that they are happier, healthier, and more vigorous, than when they ate it.*

To SUPPORT MY SECOND STATEMENT; I will submit a portion of the evidence at my disposal, but no mere words or records, can convey to your minds any adequate idea of the horrors connected with the rearing, transport, and slaughter of cattle. Let us try to trace the process, however.

Upon the ranches and farms they are branded with red-hot irons to mark them; in the winter they have no protection from

the inclemency of the weather, and perish by thousands on the plains; then comes suffering in transit by rail and road, thirst, starvation, overcrowding, exposure to cold and heat, blows, mutilation, terror, exhaustion, and wanton barbarity on the part of drovers. Only last week at Tavistock, a man was convicted of beating a bullock on the head, eyes, and ears, with a thick stick until it broke, in order to get the poor animal into a railway truck. The American Humane Association, reports that the Official statistics of the Railway Companies in that land, prove that thousands arrive at the stations dead, and thousands

---

The following resolution was passed by the American Humane Association at its 15th annual meeting held at Denver, Colorado, Oct., 1891:—

"*Resolved*, That this Association expresses its abhorrence of the inhuman practice of exposing large numbers of cattle on the plains during the winter months, without any provision being made for their food and shelter, and in consequence of which large numbers, sometimes as many as seventy-five per cent. die from cold and starvation.

more, crippled, bruised, tortured, and with broken limbs and horns. The hogs that have broken backs or limbs, are hauled by their ears and tails on to trucks, and then driven to slaughter-houses. The cattle are sometimes kept for three days and nights in hot weather without food and water.

Next comes the sea passage. On Sunday last a vessel arrived at Plymouth, having been 15 days encountering heavy seas; of her living freight of cattle, 300 had been killed by being thrown about on each other in a struggling mass, or so badly mutilated, that slaughter was resorted to. The *Western Morning News* report, stated that the rest were badly knocked about. The *Daily Telegraph*, in an article on the cruelties of cattle transport, stated, that when the wretched beasts were so mutilated as to be doomed, and the movements of the vessels precluded the men from dealing

with them, they were made by means of *tortures impossible to describe in a public newspaper, to jump overboard from sheer physical pain.* This Plymouth case is not an exceptional one; only a few weeks since 1,000 cattle were lost on one vessel, and a Veterinary Department Report to the Privy Council, records that in one year, 14,024 animals in course of transit to this country, were thrown into the sea (by what methods you must imagine), 1,240 were landed dead, and 455 were slaughtered on the quays, to save them from dying of their wounds. You may have some conception of the horrors of a cattle-boat, although nothing but seeing it in mid-ocean, could make you sufficiently realize what a floating inferno of animal torture it is. Let me tell you, that during every year three millions of living animals endure this suffering, nearly 10,000 a day arriving upon our

shores, to minister to the supposed needs of Christian England.

Next comes the slaughter-house. A journeyman butcher, writing to the *Staffordshire Daily Sentinel* of June 17th, 1879, says:—"The first lessons a butcher's apprentice generally receives, is how to torture the animals which are to be slaughtered, and he is allowed to use the axe before well able to lift it, to the indescribable agony of the poor beasts. This I have seen occur daily where a large amount of work has to be done." Some persons may say this cannot be true! To such let me reply, that a hide merchant in this county, quite recently received a bullock's skin with 27 punctures in the head, and gave up his opposition to vegetarianism in consequence, and at Newcastle a butcher was recently convicted of skinning a bullock while alive.

The distinguished New York physician, Dr. Arpad G. Gerster, while writing on another subject to the American Humane Association, gives some details of his personal observation in regard to New York slaughter-houses :—"Has any one of your Society ever been in a real slaughter-house during business hours and watched all the details of the 'merciful' ways of our butchers? I have visited the slaughter-houses for cattle and for fowls here in New York City, and speak from personal experience. . . . Watch the tragedies enacted daily on sheep and horned cattle; their terror at the stench of rotting blood, their previous maltreatment and neglect,—'they are to be killed anyhow' by drovers and other human beasts, and all this done daily all over Christendom, in all places where men dwell,—and you will get your mind full of horror at the cold-blooded,

business-like and heartless cruelty, People assert that the regular methods of slaughtering are 'merciful,' as practiced in our abattoirs. What killing is or *can* be merciful when the processes begin by maltreatment, and the artificial excitation in the victim of the fear of death?"

Mr. J. Oldfield, M. A., B. C. L., visiting the Deptford abattoirs, where the most experienced men are employed, saw a poor cow struck repeatedly, until he felt literally sick, one blow of the axe entering the eye.

Dr. Dembo, the Russian physician, visited the same place, as a specialist studying this subject, and reports "That the average number of blows of the axe were five or six. He witnessed one ox break the iron ring which held it, after receiving several cruel blows. At Messrs. Spiers & Pond's slaughter-house, he saw a poor beast poleaxed for 12 minutes, and he was un-

able to endure to the end the terrible sight of its prolonged sufferings." If this sort of thing occurs in London, what must take place in our villages and small towns?

The butcher, whose letter I have just quoted, also says, "I have seen slaughtermen make bets as to which would first have 5 or 10 sheep killed, skinned, and dressed, and you may depend upon it, they were not particular about their not being dead before skinning them. I have also seen cows kicked, their tails twisted and sawn, and their eyes burst, before they could be got into the slaughter-house, and they are frequently kept two days without food or water before being killed."

Now, having given you some faint idea of these atrocities, let me tell you that every day in Christian England, 2,800 cattle, 20,000 sheep, and 5,000 pigs, are put to death, or collectively more than

1,000 an hour. The total for the year 1888, was estimated by statisticians at 1,000,000 cattle, 7,000,000 sheep, and 2,000,000 pigs, whilst in the United States the numbers were much larger.* Consider the suffering each animal endures in its Via Dolorosa, then multiply that amount of pain by these overwhelming figures, and *try to realize if you can, your responsibility before God in this matter.* You cannot evade it now you are aware of these facts, but must either join in the protest against such doings, which ere long will arise from tens of thousands of Christian hearts in this and other lands, or go on aiding and abetting these massacres of highly organized and sensitive creatures. A hundred years ago, the Christian conscience in

* In 1894 there were killed in Chicago alone over 4,000,000 hogs, and in the United States 16,789,000. This does not include any but those killed in the large city slaughter-houses.

America, calmly acquiesced in the evils of slavery, but God sent light which illuminated the dark deeds of that system and public opinion was aroused, until the noblest in the land said, "THIS EVIL SHALL BE STOPPED." Tens of thousands of lives were sacrificed before the crime of slavery was abolished, but when the conscience of the Christian Churches is aroused on the sin of wholesale butchery and flesh eating, a still greater and more beneficent revolution will follow, and that without any appeal to arms, for *the law of England already condemns unnecessary cruelty to animals, as being indefensible from a moral standpoint, and punishable as a crime.* If a cattle-boat and its contents, as they appear in mid-ocean in rough weather, could be exposed in London for one day, a chorus of indignation would arise from thousands of outraged hearts, and the Law which ought to

punish such doings, would be invoked to end such a blot upon our civilization and humanity. Alas, this is impossible, and the Church can only be made to realize this crime, which it sanctions unwittingly, by men and women who are brave enough to deny themselves, to wash their hands from further participation in such atrocities, and then to stand alone, and *declare their conviction before God and their fellowmen that flesh eating is morally wrong and therefore ought to be abandoned.*

TO SUPPORT MY THIRD LINK IN THE CHAIN OF ARGUMENT; let me say, that official statistics prove that cattle in this and other lands suffer to a great extent from malignant diseases, such as anthrax, pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, cancer, Bright's disease, &c., &c., and that a large proportion of the flesh, daily consumed by the unsuspecting public, is that of animals killed

whilst suffering from some of these complaints. This is one of those cases where ignorance is *not* bliss, but leads to misery, disease and death.

Professor Gamgee, Medical Officer to the Privy Council, in his 5th Report, stated; "that a fifth of the total amount of the meat consumed, is derived from animals killed in a state of disease malignant or chronic," and as the Jewish experts reject one-fourth of the carcasses they examine (without the aid of a microscope), the estimate of Professor Gamgee must be well under the mark.

Let us take one disease, "Tuberculosis," which is the one most prevalent in cattle.

In Berlin Abattoir this was detected in 4,300 cattle and 6,393 pigs, in one year. In Moore Street Market, Glasgow (a comparatively small one), where the best Scotch beef would naturally be found, 200

tuberculous cattle per annum are discovered, and their internal organs condemned. How many are not discovered we cannot tell, but can guess, when we remember that the interest of the breeder, and the butcher, lies involved in hushing up the fact of tubercles being found. During the month of May, 1892, 52,085 pounds of diseased meat were seized in Edinburgh Market. An Inspector of the Metropolitan Meat Market, asserted upon oath that he believed 80 per cent. of the meat sent to the London Meat Market was tuberculous, and that to exclude such meat would leave the public without a supply.

It is the custom all over this country to sell the flesh of tuberculous animals as fit for food, even when the external organs or other portions are condemned. If you ask "is it not safe to do so?" let me ask you if it is in accordance with the dictates of common

sense to do so? If the organs of an animal prove on examination to be tuberculous, how can the blood, which has circulated through these organs be pure, and if it is impure what hope is there that the flesh is untainted with disease? Wholesome food can be found; why incur the least liability of introducing loathsome disease into our systems?

The Society of Medical Officers of Health at Manchester, on May 20th, 1892, resolved: "That the flesh of any animal affected with tuberculosis, *to however slight an extent*, is unfit to be sold as human food."

It is impossible to tell whether the bacilli are in the flesh, unless the whole of it is examined with a powerful microscope; this is impracticable, therefore, if the lungs or other organs are found infected with tubercle, it cannot be safe to eat the flesh.

You will be able to realize the danger which is constantly incurred, when I tell you that the inspectors of the Central Meat Market, London, do not see the slaughtering or the internal organs at all, but only examine the meat with the naked eye, a long time after it has been killed and dressed. *This is in Englana's model meat market.*

The use of the flesh of animals affected by tuberculosis is perhaps the chief cause of tubercular disease in the human race. If ever we are to abolish the great scourge of consumption, we must first prevent the causes.

Has meat inspection as carried on in the larger establishments made everything safe in America? It may prevent a certain amount of immature veal, or almost putrefying flesh from being exposed for sale in our great cities. But it is not pretended that inspection in great slaughter-

ing establishments is done except in the most rapid and conventional way. The inspector decides the question by a glance of his eye,—not by the microscope, and yet *only by the microscope* can one say positively whether tubercle is there or not. Then, too, inspection is entirely absent outside large cities. Private slaughter-houses exist all over our country, particularly in the smaller cities and towns where government inspection is never heard of. These establishments belong to the butchers themselves. A farmer, for example, notices that one of his cows is beginning to lose flesh or to cough, and he determines to "get rid of her" as soon as possible. How? Why, by selling it to the first butcher that will buy it. He congratulates himself that his responsibility is now ended. Suppose that the butcher kills it, and upon cutting open the carcass, discovers in the

vital organs certain evident signs of disease? What is he to do about it? He has paid the farmer some twenty dollars or over for the animal. Does anybody expect he is to throw all this money away? Nobody but himself or his assistants has seen the vital organs where alone are to be discovered the signs of disease. So he cuts up the animal's body; and in steaks and roasts and other forms, it finds its way within a day or two to a hundred tables. A few months afterwards, some young man or woman just entering upon life shows signs of lung disease. Who is to blame? The farmer? The butcher? Yes, but not they alone. *They also are to blame who sanction the eating of flesh so liable to be thus infected with deadly disease.*

George Dock, of Ann Arbor, Mich., in November, 1895, in a letter to the editor of the "Medical News" and printed in that paper, asks:

"WHAT IS THE VALUE OF OUR MEAT INSPECTION?" He says:—"The butcher of the University Hospital at Ann Arbor, Mich., recently called my attention to a beef-liver just received with a lot of other meat from a large meat-firm. The surface of the liver showed numerous irregular or stellate scars, up to two inches in diameter. Beneath these the tissue was dense. On sections we found calcified cysts scattered through the liver. These varied from 0.5 cm. to 2 cm. in diameter, had firm walls, and were filled with dark, gritty material. All the cysts were old; no evidence could be found as to the origin of the cysts. The cysts were so numerous that a section could hardly be made through the liver without revealing one. The liver could not be looked on as dangerous to the consumer. It was not, however, inviting. It raises, I think, the question at the

head of this note. Every quarter of meat received from the firm concerned bears a seal, attached to a card. The latter has on it the legend, "United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry, Inspected Meat. J. Sterling Morton, Secretary." There is also a number and a letter stamped in red ink. If lesions such as were found in this liver are overlooked, how can we suppose that trichinae, measles, or tuberculosis can be discovered by the so-called inspectors? Does not the use of the card under the circumstances tend to create a false sense of security, or is the matter one in which the public takes no interest?"

Dr. Koch, the discoverer of the Bacillus of Tubercle tells us that 10,000 of these creatures put end to end, would cover 1 inch of space, their eggs or spores being more minute still. He also says they can

withstand the heat of boiling water for some time, and yet live. Drs. Strauss and Wurtz proved that the active fluids of the alimentary canal and gastric juice do not kill them. This being the case, every joint which comes to table with the red gravy in the centre, has living bacilli in it, if the animal's flesh was infected when killed, and the bacilli pass into the system. *Is it to be wondered at, in view of these facts, that one person in every five in this country, dies of tuberculosis*, especially when we remember that medical opinion now unanimously pronounces consumption to be infectious. Some churches in America have provided a separate cup for each communicant, because the bacilli of tubercle were discovered by the microscope, on the cup which was used in common by all.

Dr. Coats stated in a paper read before the Annual Congress of the Sanitary Asso-

ciation of Scotland in 1891, that "We may safely affirm that of the total deaths under 10 years of age amongst the mass of the people, one-third are from tuberculosis." Some persons think it is our climate, yet in Australia, where perpetual summer weather is usual, tuberculosis in its various forms, scrofula, consumption, &c., is as prevalent as in this country, whilst cancer is, I believe, more so, and medical men there, consider the reason to be, that the people eat more flesh than the English, because it is so cheap.

Dr. Marsden, Medical Officer at Birkenhead, stated on oath: "That he believed consumption was constantly communicated to human beings by eating diseased meat."

Why is cancer increasing so fast? Dr. Humphrey has expressed the opinion that flesh eating is one of the principal causes. Facts help to confirm this opinion. A

gentleman in this town used to farm sheep in Australia, and told me the flocks used to be terribly thinned by a disease closely resembling cancer in man; the Australians eat mutton to a larger extent even than we do, and it is alleged that much of it is cancerous mutton. Cancer is certainly increasing to an alarming extent in that favoured land amongst human beings. Quite recently I heard of a family in this country cutting into a leg of mutton, and finding a large tumor. *You can draw your own conclusions, and reflect whether flesh eating should be continued by yourselves and your children.*

Pork is quite as dangerous, for measles, tuberculosis, and trichinosis are prevalent amongst pigs. They are often fed upon the intestines of cattle, diseased or otherwise. At Helstadt, in Prussia, in 1863, 103 persons ate some diseased pork, and

within a month 20 were devoured alive by the parasite known as Trichina Spiralis. No cure is known for this disease.

Apart from infectious diseases, flesh eating is undoubtedly one cause of rheumatic gout, and all medical men prescribe abstinence from flesh in such cases. Liver complaints, dyspepsia, and other ills, certainly follow upon this violation of nature's law for man, and are generally cured by abandoning the habit. In Genesis I., 29, we are told that God said to Adam and Eve: "Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed: *to you it shall be for meat!*" Well had it been for our unhappy race, if this commandment had never been broken, and the sooner we get back to the doing of God's Will upon earth in this matter, the better for us all.

To support my fourth statement, I need not tell you that animal food is a stimulant, that it inflames the passions, and rouses all that is pugnacious, selfish, and cruel, both in men and animals, when they are fed upon it. This fact is patent to all, from observation, history, and experience, and we do not require to be told that the strengthening of all that is carnal within us, does not promote our moral or spiritual well being. The founders of the various religious orders I have mentioned this evening, recognized this fact, and religious leaders, saints, prophets, and reformers in all ages, have endorsed it. Amongst others, were Pythagoras, Buddha, Socrates, Daniel, Origen, Francis Assissi, Gassendi, Plato, John Howard, Swedenborg, and John Wesley. Wherever flesh eating is most prevalent, it will be found that drunkenness exists to a proportionate

extent. Man inflames the coats of his stomach with flesh meat, and thereby irritates his nervous system, he then craves for stimulants and narcotics to soothe him. Many physicians have recognized this fact.

Archdeacon Farrar has recently stated that he believes the habit of flesh eating, is one of the principle causes of the drink crave.

Sir H. Thompson, F. R. C. S., writes that he has been compelled by facts, to accept the conclusion that more physical evil accrues to man from erroneous habits of eating, than from alcoholic drink, and he suspects this is the case also with moral evil.

This latter opinion, which doubtless had reference to the harm done to man's moral nature *directly*, by the consumption of flesh and blood, is suggestive of the *indirect* evil which results from the barbarous

practice, and the fact that where slaughter and bloodshed are most prevalent, the people become brutalized and crime increases. In the East end of London, where slaughter-houses are numbered by hundreds, where little children are sent with jugs to be filled with warm blood, and are thus accustomed to scenes of violence and cruelty from babyhood, crime, degradation, and ferocity are rampant. There is no doubt that butchery debases the community and lowers the tone of public morals.

The effect of butchering in blunting moral sensitiveness is well understood. It is a curious fact, as shown by the census of 1890, that the number of murders in the United States attributed to butchers exceeds that of any other known avocation.

It is time the Temperance Party realized the fact, *that abstinence from flesh is of far*

greater importance than abstinence from strong drink, for the latter practically includes the former, makes it possible, and goes far beyond it, in the work of reforming mankind, as nearly all vegetarians become abstainers from choice before long, and not a single vegetarian drunkard can be produced, I believe, in this land.

The overcrowding of our cities would be relieved by this great reform, as agricultural labourers in large numbers, would be required to till the land, if flesh eating were abandoned, in favour of a diet of fruits, seeds and vegetables, *thus solving one of our greatest social problems;* vice would decrease, and poverty would soon disappear. The prevalent spirit of cruelty (with its horrors of vivisection, and its utter disregard of the rights of animals) would soon begin to pass away, our hospitals, prisons, and workhouses would cease to be crowded,

and there would be some hope of peace, good will, contentment and happiness being experienced by all.

Here is a field of work which promises a rich and immediate harvest. How can you better serve God and mankind, than by lessening the sum of human suffering and depravity? By helping to turn men from this evil habit with its far reaching consequences, you adopt a practical method of combating drunkenness, cruelty, poverty, and sin. You will aid the work of evangelizing the people, by rendering them more susceptible to Christian influences, for man's carnality and selfishness are the roots of all evil, and although these can only be effectually removed by God's Spirit, yet they are fostered and strengthened very materially by flesh eating. Let me urge you then, to reflect upon the evil, disease and suffering you may

prevent, and the immediate and prospective good you may do, by abandoning this custom, and by doing all in your power to cause others to do the same. Butchery, cruelty and flesh eating must be ended, before the prophetic day dawns, when pain and weeping shall cease.

There are many persons here present, whose chief desire is to build a Christ-like character, who aspire to reach the highest and best that is possible to us. May I, with humility remind you, that the path of self-denial trodden for conscience sake, is one of the most direct roads to the attainment of that desire, and that the fundamental Laws of our physical organization, demand our reverence as surely as those given from Mount Sinai; also that perfect love is utterly incompatible with the unnecessary perpetration of cruelty. *For your own highest welfare, for that of your children*

and posterity, for the sake of suffering humanity, and the millions of sentient creatures who are doomed to-night to agony and death, I plead with you to face your responsibility, and obey the voice of conscience in this matter.

Note to Third Edition.

Many persons having fallen into the error, of assuming that the Author challenges the practice of eating fish, upon moral grounds, he wishes it to be understood that such is not the case, although much might doubtless be urged against the wisdom of the habit. This pamphlet, however, is only directed against the custom of eating the dead bodies of animals, mainly because it involves a vast amount of suffering, which being unnecessary, is unjustifiable.

Any person interested in this question, who may be desirous of obtaining addi-

tional information on the subject, can do so, by writing to,

Mr. SIDNEY H. BEARD,
The Beacon,
Ilfracombe, England,

who will be pleased to advise any sincere inquirer, how to get over whatever inconveniences and difficulties may be experienced, in first adopting this reform in diet. Any suggestion as to books dealing comprehensively with the matter and the solution of mental or social difficulties apparently involved, will be willingly given.

The Author having received many letters asking for advice about Vegetarian Cookery, considers it best to state, that a list of Books can be obtained upon application to The Manager, "Vegetarian Office," Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London. The following are recommended, viz:—

How to Begin (O'Callaghan) . *4 cts.*
Best Way to Begin (Oldfield) . *4 cts.*
Best 6d. Cookery Book (Oldfield) . *12 cts.*
Practical Vegetarian Recipes (Forward) . . . . . *30 cts.*
366 Menus (Wallace) . . . *30 cts.*
Novel Vegetarian Dishes (Mary Pope) . . . . . *84 cts.*

"Tuberculosis" (Oldfield, *12 cts.*), and "Essays" (A. F. Hills, *48 cts.*), are worthy of perusal by all thoughtful persons.

"The perfect way in diet (Dr. A. Kingsford, *48 cts.*), published by Koga Paul & Co., is also full of useful information.

From the Vegetarian Society, 9 Peter St., Manchester, England, a list of books and pamphlets on the subject may be obtained. Among those are the following:

A Plea for Vegetarianism, and Other Essays. Henry S. Salt. *24 cts.*
Against Killing Customs. Rev. W. Godfrey. *12 cts.*

A Plea for a Broken Law. Rev. H. J. Williams. *8 cts.*

The Case Against Butchers' Meat. C. W. Forward. *24 cts.*

The following books and pamphlets can be obtained by addressing Box 215, Providence, R. I.:

The Evils of Butchery, by Josiah Oldfield, M. A., B. C. L. *Price, 20 cts.*

Behind the Scenes in Slaughter Houses, by H. F. Lester. *Price, 8 cts.*

Cattle Ships and our Meat Supply, by I. M. Greg and S. H. Towers. *Price, 8 cts.*

Fruit and Farinacea, the Proper Food of Man, by Smith & Trall. *Price, $1.50.*

Hydropathic Cook Book. Paper cover, *50 cts.*; cloth, *$1.00.*

Health in the Household, by S. W. Dodds, A. M., M. D. *Price, $2.00.*

This book, although not strictly vegetarian, gives valuable information and many recipes suitable for vegetarians.

Eating for Strength, by M. L. Holbrook, M. D. *Price, $1.00.*

Fruit and Bread, by Gustav Schlickeysen. *Price, $1.00.*

This pamphlet can be obtained by addressing Box 215, Providence, R. I. Price, 6 cts. for one copy; 60 cts. per dozen; $4.00 per hundred, postage paid.

On application any list of new literature or information on the subject will be gladly sent.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall